

1 LAW OFFICES OF
2 **WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER**
3 A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

4 650 CALIFORNIA STREET, 26TH FLOOR
5 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108-2615
6 T: (415) 981-7210 · F: (415) 391-6965

7 MICHAEL A. KELLY (State Bar #71460)
8 mkelly@walkuplawoffice.com
9 RICHARD H. SCHOENBERGER (State Bar #122190)
10 rschoenberger@walkuplawoffice.com
11 MATTHEW D. DAVIS (State Bar #141986)
12 mdavis@walkuplawoffice.com
13 ASHCON MINOIEFAR (State Bar #347583)
14 aminoiefar@walkuplawoffice.com
15 ELISE GORBERG (State Bar #)
16 egorberg@walkuplawoffice.com

17 SHANIN SPECTER (Pennsylvania State Bar No. 40928)
18 (Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
19 shanin.specter@klinespecter.com
20 ALEX VAN DYKE (CA State Bar No. 340379)
21 alex.vandyke@klinespecter.com
22 KLINE & SPECTER, P.C.
23 1525 Locust Street
24 Philadelphia, PA 19102
25 Telephone: (215) 772-1000
26 Facsimile: (215) 772-1359

27 **ATTORNEYS FOR ALL PLAINTIFFS**

28 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
1 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO/OAKLAND
2 DIVISION

3 JANE ROE, an individual; MARY ROE,
4 an individual; SUSAN ROE, an
5 individual; JOHN ROE, an individual;
6 BARBARA ROE, an individual;
7 PHOENIX HOTEL SF, LLC, a
8 California limited liability company;
9 FUNKY FUN, LLC, a California limited
10 liability company; and 2930 EL
11 CAMINO, LLC, a California limited
12 liability company,

13 Plaintiffs,
14
15 v.

16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
17 FRANCISCO, a California public entity,

18 Case No. 4:24-cv-01562-JST

19 **PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR
20 JUDICIAL NOTICE**

21 *Filed concurrently with Plaintiffs' Reply
22 in Support of Motion for Preliminary
23 Injunction*

24 **ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES
25 TO THE HONORABLE DISTRICT
26 JUDGE JON S. TIGAR,
27 COURTROOM 6**

28 Action Filed: 03/14/2024
Trial Date: Unassigned

Defendants.

I. INTRODUCTION

4 Plaintiffs request, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b), that the Court
5 take judicial notice of three legal complaints filed in the San Francisco Superior
6 Court by the San Francisco City Attorney's Office on behalf of Defendant City and
7 County of San Francisco, and the City Attorney's press release about those lawsuits.
8 Plaintiffs also request that the Court take judicial notice of a document issued by the
9 San Francisco Department of Public Health, entitled "*Pilot Treatment Connections*
10 *and Safer Use Supplies Distribution Policy*," dated April 2, 2025.

II. DOCUMENTS FOR WHICH NOTICE IS REQUESTED

1. **File-endorsed complaint** filed by the San Francisco City Attorney in *City and County of San Francisco and the People of the State of California v. 2008 Oh Family Trust, et al.*, Case No. CGC-25-624263 (Declaration of Ashcon Minoiefar, ¶2, Exhibit A).
2. **File-endorsed complaint** filed by the San Francisco City Attorney in *City and County of San Francisco and the People of the State of California v. Ursula Fung, et al.*, Case No. CGC-25-624264 (Declaration of Ashcon Minoiefar, ¶3, Exhibit B).
3. **File-endorsed complaint** filed by the San Francisco City Attorney in *City and County of San Francisco and the People of the State of California v. 155 Turk Street Associates L.P.*, Case No. CGC-25-624266, (Declaration of Ashcon Minoiefar, ¶4, Exhibit C).
4. **Press release** issued by the San Francisco City Attorney's Office titled "*City Attorney Sues Tenderloin Drug and Gambling Dens Fronting as Small Businesses*" (May 23, 2024), available at <https://sfcityattorney.org/city-attorney-sues-tenderloin-drug-and-gambling-dens-fronting-as-small-businesses/> (Declaration of Ashcon Minoiefar, ¶5, Exhibit D).
5. **SFDPH policy** titled *San Francisco Department of Public Health Pilot Treatment Connections and Safer Use Supplies Distribution Policy* (April 2, 2025) (Declaration of Ashcon Minoiefar, ¶6, Exhibit E).

1 **III. ARGUMENT**

2 Under Federal Rule of Evidence 201(b), a court may take judicial notice of a
 3 fact “not subject to reasonable dispute because it...can be accurately and readily
 4 determined from sources whose accuracy cannot reasonably be questioned.” Federal
 5 courts routinely take judicial notice of court filings and other matters of public
 6 record. *See United States ex rel. Robinson Rancheria Citizens Council v. Borneo, Inc.*,
 7 971 F.2d 244, 248 (9th Cir. 1992).

8 **A. The Four Documents Relating to the City’s Nuisance Lawsuits
 9 Against Tenderloin Markets.**

10 The first four documents relate to nuisance actions that the City Attorney
 11 filed, on April 10, 2025, in the name of the City and the People of the State of
 12 California against the owners and operators of three neighborhood markets in the
 13 Tenderloin. Exhibits A, B, and C are file-endorsed copies of complaints filed by the
 14 San Francisco City Attorney against the owners and operators of stores in the
 15 Tenderloin that allegedly, among other things, sold drug paraphernalia. The
 16 complaints allege that this activity “attracted criminal and nuisance activity to the
 17 surrounding community...adversely affecting the neighborhood and the health,
 18 safety, and well-being of those who live and work in the area.” (Ex. A at ¶ 2; Ex. B at
 19 ¶ 2; Ex. C at ¶ 2.) The City’s complaints allege that the defendants sold
 20 paraphernalia “used to ingest or inhale controlled substances,” and that this conduct
 21 “adversely affects public health, contributes to illegal drug activity, and contributes
 22 to other criminal activity.” (Ex. A at ¶ 54; Ex. B at ¶ 45; Ex. C at ¶ 41.) The City
 23 Attorney’s press release announcing these suits reinforces those allegations,
 24 describing the stores as “magnets for substantial illegal activity,” and stating that
 25 their operations “threaten the safety of the children, families, and seniors in [the]
 26 community.” (Ex. D)

27 Plaintiffs do not offer these materials for the truth of the matters asserted in
 28 them. Rather, they are properly noticed to establish that the City made the

1 statements and allegations contained in them. Courts regularly take judicial notice of
 2 public records for this limited, non-hearsay purpose—namely, to show that a party
 3 made inconsistent representations or to permit impeachment. (See *Lee v. City of Los*
 4 *Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 689–90 (9th Cir. 2001) (court may take notice of public records
 5 “not for the truth of the facts recited therein, but for the existence” of the records).)
 6 These materials collectively demonstrate the inconsistency between the City’s prior
 7 statements condemning the sale of smoking paraphernalia as harmful and its
 8 current policy permitting the free distribution of the same supplies under the guise of
 9 harm reduction.

10 This distinction matters here. The City’s recent nuisance complaints and
 11 public press release—each asserting that the sale of smoking paraphernalia “attracts
 12 crime” and “endangers public health”—flatly contradict the City’s current defense of
 13 its own policy pertaining to the distribution of identical paraphernalia by City-funded
 14 vendors. Judicial notice for impeachment and inconsistency serves the Rule 201
 15 purpose of clarifying the record without turning these statements into factual
 16 findings. (See *Reyn’s Pasta Bella, LLC v. Visa USA, Inc.*, 442 F.3d 741, 746 n.6 (9th
 17 Cir. 2006) (taking notice of filings to indicate what was filed, not for the truth of the
 18 contents).)

19 Because these materials are official court filings and an official government
 20 press release, whose authenticity and content cannot reasonably be disputed, they
 21 are properly subject to judicial notice under Rule 201(b).

22 **B. The April 2, 2025 Version of the City’s Policy Permitting the
 23 Distribution of Smoking Paraphernalia differs significantly
 24 from the earlier version of that policy that the City submitted to
 25 this Court.**

26 The fifth document, Exhibit E, is the April 2, 2025 version of the official policy
 27 by which the City permits its contractors and subcontractors to distribute “safer use”
 28 smoking paraphernalia, such as pipes, foil, and straws. This version of the policy,
 which Plaintiffs found on the City’s official website, differs significantly from the

1 April 1, 2025 version of the policy that the City submitted to this Court. ECF no. 105-
 2 53 (Ex. G to Philip Decl. entitled “*SFDPH Pilot Policy: Connections to Treatment and*
 3 *Safer Use Supplies Distribution*”).

4 The April 1 version of the policy, the version which the City proffered to this
 5 Court, states that the vendors that distribute the paraphernalia “**must include**
 6 **proactive counseling (e.g. with motivational interviewing) and connections**
 7 **to treatment.**” *Id.* (boldface in original).

8 The April 2 version of the policy, which Plaintiffs proffer to the Court,
 9 however, sets forth an exception to this rule: “all programs must offer treatment
 10 referrals and connections to treatment at every interaction to the extent practical
 11 and receivable by the participant.” (Ex. E at p. 2.) As discussed in Plaintiffs’ reply
 12 brief, one City contractor has, with the City’s approval, expanded this exception to
 13 the point where it has swallowed the rule. (See Reply discussion of testimony of Dr.
 14 Tyler TerMeer.) Moreover, the April 2 version of the policy, unlike the April 1
 15 version, explicitly authorizes the distribution of smoking paraphernalia to minors. *Id.*
 16 at section 5, p. 3. As one City-funded contractor admitted, a child who looks no older
 17 than 10-years old can obtain free paraphernalia. (See testimony of Dr. Tyler TerMeer
 18 cited in Plaintiffs’ reply.) Plaintiffs contend that handing out fentanyl pipes to
 19 *children* in the neighborhood is a harm that outweighs any benefit.

20 This SFDPH document qualifies for judicial notice under Rule 201(b) because
 21 it is an official government publication whose accuracy and authenticity cannot
 22 reasonably be questioned. Courts regularly take notice of similar materials. (See
 23 *Daniels-Hall v. Nat'l Educ. Ass'n*, 629 F.3d 992, 998-99 (9th Cir. 2010) (taking notice
 24 of official government information published online).)

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **IV. CONCLUSION**

2 For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court take
3 judicial notice of Exhibits A-E.

4 Dated: November 21, 2025 WALKUP, MELODIA, KELLY & SCHOENBERGER

5 By: 
6

7 ASHCON MINIEFAR
8 Attorneys for ALL PLAINTIFFS

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 **Jane Roe, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.**
3 **USDC-Northern California Case No. 4:24-cv-01562-JST**

4 At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action.
5 I am employed in the county where the mailing took place. My business address is
6 650 California Street, 26th Floor, City and County of San Francisco, CA 94108-2615.

7 On the date set forth below, I caused to be served true copies of the following
8 document(s) described as

9 **PLAINTIFFS' REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE**

10 to:

11 Shanin Specter, Esq.
(Admitted Pro Hac Vice)
12 Alex Van Dyke, Esq.
13 KLINE & SPECTER, P.C.
14 1525 Locust Street
15 Philadelphia, PA 19102

16 David Chiu, Esq., City Attorney
17 Yvonne R. Meré, Esq., Chief Deputy
18 City Attorney
19 Wayne Snodgrass, Esq., Deputy City
20 Attorney
21 Tara M. Steeley, Esq., Deputy City
22 Attorney
23 John H. George, Esq., Deputy City
24 Attorney
25 Kaitlyn M. Murphy, Esq., Deputy
26 City Attorney
27 Abigail Wald, Esq., Deputy City
28 Attorney
29 Deputy City Attorneys
30 City Hall, Room 234
31 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
32 San Francisco, CA 94102-4682

33 **Co-Counsel for Plaintiffs**

34 Telephone: (215) 772-1000
35 shanin.specter@klinespecter.com
36 alex.vandyke@klinespecter.com
37 escalanteyleana@uclawsf.edu

38 **Counsel for City and County of San
39 Francisco**

40 Steeley Direct: (415) 554-4655
41 George Direct: (415) 554-4223
42 Murphy Direct: (415) 554-6762
43 Facsimile: (415) 554-4699
44 Mere Direct: (415) 554-4700
45 Mere Facsimile: (415) 554-4757
46 tara.steeley@sfcityatty.org
47 john.george@sfcityatty.org
48 kaitlyn.murphy@sfcityatty.org
49 Abigail.Wald@sfcityatty.org
50 anita.murdock@sfcityatty.org
51 sophia.garcia@sfcityatty.org
52 holly.chin@sfcityatty.org
53 pamela.cheeseborough@sfcityatty.org
54 Elizabeth.coolbrith@sfcityatty.org

55 **Counsel for Plaintiff College of the
56 Law, San Francisco**
57 (related case USDC-Northern California
58 case #4:20-cv-03033-JST)

59 Telephone: (415) 565-4787
60 Facsimile: (415) 565-4825
61 dipaolojohn@uchastings.edu

1 Lauren Hansen, Esq.
2 Melissa A. Morris, Esq.
3 Public Interest Law Project
4 449 15th Street, Suite 301
5 Oakland, CA 94612-06001

Counsel for Proposed Intervenors
Hospitality House; Coalition on
Homelessness; and Faithful Fools
(related case USDC-Northern California
case #4:20-cv-03033-JST)

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Office: (510) 891-9794
Fax: (510) 891-9727
lhansen@pilpca.org
mmorris@pilpca.org

Lili V. Graham, Esq.
Disability Rights California
350 S. Bixel Street Suite 290
Los Angeles, CA 90017-1418

Counsel for Proposed Intervenors
Hospitality House; Coalition on
Homelessness; and Faithful Fools
(related case USDC-Northern California
case #4:20-cv-03033-JST)

Office: (213) 213-8000
Fax: (213) 213-8001
lili.graham@disabilityrightsca.org

Michael David Key, Esq.
Jessica Berger, Esq.
Bay Area Legal Aid
1454 43rd Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94122

Counsel for Proposed Intervenors
Hospitality House; Coalition on
Homelessness; and Faithful Fools
(related case USDC-Northern California
case #4:20-cv-03033-JST)

Office: (415) 982-1300
Fax: (415) 982-4243
mkeys@baylegal.org
jberger@baylegal.org

John Thomas H. Do, Esq.
ACLU Foundation of Northern
California
39 Drumm Street
San Francisco, CA 94111

Counsel for Amicus Curiae
(ACLU Foundation of Northern
California)
(related case USDC-Northern California
case #4:20-cv-03033-JST)

Office: (415) 621-2943
ido@aclunc.org

25 **BY CM/ECF NOTICE OF ELECTRONIC FILING:** I electronically filed the
26 document(s) with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system. Participants
27 in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the CM/ECF system.
Participants in the case who are not registered CM/ECF users will be served by mail
or by other means permitted by the court rules.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of
America that the foregoing is true and correct and that I am employed in the office of

1 a member of the bar of this Court at whose direction the service was made.

2 Executed on November 21, 2025, at San Francisco, California.

3 
4

5 Kirsten Benzien
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28